Report to the Legislature on: Intervention and Targeted Assistance Efforts

---

Funded by FY08 Budget Line Item 7061-9408
February 2008

Massachusetts Department of Education
350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370
www.doe.mass.edu

This document was prepared by the
Massachusetts Department of Education
Jeffrey Nellhaus
Acting Commissioner of Education

Board of Education Members
Mr. Paul Reville, Chairman, Cambridge
Ms. Ann Reale, Vice-Chair, Commissioner, Early Education and Care, Boston
Mr. Christopher Anderson, Waltham
Ms. Harneen Chernow, Roxbury
Dr. Thomas E. Fortmann, Lexington
Ms. Ruth Kaplan, Brookline
Dr. Patricia Plummer, Chancellor, Higher Education, Boston
Dr. Sandra L. Stotsky, Brookline
Mr. Zachary Tsetsos, Chair, Student Advisory Council, Oxford
Jeffrey Nellhaus, Acting Commissioner
and Secretary to the Board

The Massachusetts Department of Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public. We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex or sexual orientation.
Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 350 Main St., Malden, MA 02148 781-338-6105.

© 2007 Massachusetts Department of Education
Permission is hereby granted to copy any or all parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes. Please credit the "Massachusetts Department of Education."

This document printed on recycled paper

Massachusetts Department of Education
350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5023
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370
www.doe.mass.edu

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

350 Main Street, Malden, Massachusetts 02148-5023

Telephone: (781) 338-3000
TTY: N.E.T. Relay 1-800-439-2370

Jeffrey Nellhaus
Acting Commissioner
of Education

Table of Contents

Overview 2

I. State System for Identification of Underperforming Schools and Districts 3
- Identifying Accountability Status under NCLB
- Process Changes for Identifying Underperforming Schools

II. Targeted Assistance and intervention in Commonwealth Priority Schools 5
- Diagnostic Fact finding Review
- District Planning for School Intervention
- Implementation guidance and Support
- Leadership Development Training and Support
- Follow-up Panel Reviews

III. Chronically Underperforming Schools 9
- Commonwealth Pilot Schools

IV. Intervention in Underperforming Districts 13

V. Identification and Recognition of Schools Showing Significant Improvement 16

VI. FY 08 Intervention Account Budget and FY 08 Budget Recommendations 17

VII. Appendix .....

Overview

The Massachusetts Department of Education's Accountability and Targeted Assistance (ATA) Center maintains and manages the state's School and District Accountability System. Results from the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) are used to identify public schools and districts that are likely to require state intervention in order to ensure improvements in student performance, and to identify schools with exemplary performance and improvement. Schools and districts that fail to meet State performance and improvement standards for four or more consecutive years are identified as Commonwealth Priority Schools and are provided with targeted assistance to support district-led improvement efforts. State intervention in underperforming schools and districts is a multi-step process described in the report below. Schools exiting Commonwealth Priority School status as a result of sustained student performance gains will be eligible, for the first time this year, for "Sustaining Success" grants. Those schools showing significant improvement in their students' performance in Mathematics and English Language Arts are eligible for designation as Commonwealth Compass Schools.

Since the inception of the Education Reform Act 15 years ago, ATA's work with low performing schools and districts has informed our thinking about the time, support and effort it takes on the part of a school, a district and the state agency to make progress. We have begun to reexamine our state policies, practices and procedures to understand how our actions are supporting improvement and/or whether state systems are impeding those efforts. Our work is evolving based on a more collaborative approach; our interest is in taking the state system of accountability and targeted assistance to a new level of coherence and transparency in order to meet the goal of all students in all schools reaching proficiency and beyond.

I. State System for Identification of Underperforming Schools and Districts

Identifying Accountability Status under NCLB

On an annual basis, The Massachusetts Department of Education (the Department) issues Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for MA public schools and school districts. The performance and improvement data for each school and district, together with data on MCAS participation, student attendance, and graduation rates is compiled and analyzed to determine, for each school and district, whether students in the aggregate and student subgroups within the school have made adequate progress toward the achievement of state performance targets in English language arts and mathematics. AYP determinations are used to assign each school an "accountability status". The category to which a school is assigned is based on its AYP determinations over multiple years and determines the course of action a school, district and/or state is expected to take to improve student performance. Accountability status categories include *Identified for Improvement*, *Corrective Action* and *Restructuring*. Schools that make AYP in a subject for all student groups for two or more consecutive years are assigned to the *No Status* category. A district or school may be placed in an accountability status on the basis of the performance and improvement profile of students in the aggregate or of one or more student subgroups over two or more years in English Language Arts and/or Mathematics.

In 2007, 1792 schools received AYP determinations. Of the 1792 schools receiving determinations, 674 schools (about 38%) were identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring, as indicated in the table below.

SCHOOLS	Identified for Improvement	Corrective Action	Restructuring	Total
Aggregate	201	25	77	**303**
Subgroups	165	92	114	**371**
Total	**366**	**117**	**191**	**674**

Additional detailed information is available in Attachment A.

In the fall of 2007, 239 districts that operate multiple schools received AYP determinations. Districts that operate only one school only receive a school AYP determination rather than a district determination. Of the districts receiving determinations, 47 were identified for improvement or corrective action, as indicated in the table below. In 2006 Massachusetts began issuing separate district-level adequate yearly progress (AYP) determinations at the elementary, middle, and high school grade-spans. Under this approach, districts are only identified for improvement when they fail to make AYP in the same subject area in all grade-spans. With 2007 AYP reporting, many districts that had been identified for improvement under our previous methodology were removed from the list of districts identified for improvement.

DISTRICTS	Identified for Improvement	Corrective Action
Aggregate	0	9
Subgroups	11	27

Sample District and School AYP reports are found in Attachments B.

Lists of schools identified for improvement, corrective action and restructuring for 2007 can be found at http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/ayp/2007/

2006 Process Changes for Identifying Underperforming Schools
In October 2006, the Massachusetts Board of Education (the Board) approved new regulations that guide the Department's actions regarding underperforming schools. *Regulation 603 CRM 2.00: Underperforming Schools and School Districts* can be found at http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr2.html?section=03 and are included as Attachment C.

The revised regulations designate schools with an NCLB status of *corrective action* or *restructuring* for students in the aggregate as *Commonwealth Priority Schools*. Schools formerly declared by the Commissioner to be *underperforming* are also awarded Commonwealth Priority School status. Formal notification to the operating district that a school has been placed in Commonwealth Priority School status initiates the 30-day timeframe for the district to seek reconsideration or to submit an improvement plan. Districts' plans for improving Commonwealth Priority Schools are to be vetted by a State Review Panel, comprised of members appointed by the Commissioner and approved by the Board of Education.

In February 2008, The Department will issue letters of notification formally designating the 53 new (not previously designated) Commonwealth Priority School(s) in nine of the Commonwealth's urban districts (Boston, Brockton, Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, New Bedford, Springfield and Worcester) known as the "Commissioner's Districts". This will launch a four-month process of preparation, review and approval of district plans for improving student performance in these schools. Later in this year, the remaining 13 schools, spread out among 11 smaller districts across the state, that meet the criteria for designation as Commonwealth Priority Schools will be notified.

II. Targeted Assistance and Intervention in Commonwealth Priority Schools

When a school is identified as a Commonwealth Priority School, The Department offers Targeted Assistance in the form of:

- diagnostic *fact finding*, a series of specific interventions, including identification of reasons for low student performance and professional development needs, and training and support for data-driven improvement planning;
- district planning for school intervention, providing guidance and support for the development of a plan to identify and address key improvement initiative at the district and school levels; and
- implementation guidance and support, strategies that measure the effectiveness of the planned improvement initiatives based on results.

Diagnostic Fact Finding

Underperforming schools have historically participated in a diagnostic *fact finding* review, designed to assist the school in determining the priority learning needs of its students. This work informed the school's improvement planning. Under this model, a fact finding team of up to five educational consultants and practitioners spends two and a half days reviewing data and information on the school, interacting with school leaders and staff, and developing findings to guide improvement planning. The purposes of the fact finding review are:

- to provide an in-depth diagnosis of the school's strengths and areas for improvement by focusing on the causes / reasons for low student performance,
- to make specific priority recommendations for the development of the school's improvement plan.

The fact finding team's judgments are guided by a protocol that addresses curriculum, instruction and assessment, school leadership, school climate and organizational structure, and district support for improvement initiatives at the school. Evidence is collected through observations of teaching and learning, interviews of faculty, students, families, administrators, district personnel and other school stakeholders and through the review of documents, including testing information, curriculum documents, and student work. The fact finding report provides clear identification of strengths and weaknesses and priority recommendations for areas upon which the school should focus in planning for improvement.

In the fall of 2006, we redesigned the diagnostic fact finding process to include district and school personnel in the process of gathering and analyzing data at each of the Commonwealth Priority Schools in their district. Our intention in implementing this change was to help district personnel better understand the impact of improvement efforts and, when needed, to problem solve together and adjust systems and supports to enhance the achievement of intended results. Using data-driven, inquiry-based processes, fact finding reviews were conducted in 2006-2007 in six schools in Boston and seven schools in Worcester. In both cases, we engaged external partners to lead the fact finding

reviews. More information on the Department's Fact Finding Review Process is available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/review/.

District Planning for School Intervention

The Fact Finding Reviews described above resulted in the development of *District Plans for School Intervention* in both Boston and Worcester. In each case, those plans were ultimately approved by the Board of Education in the winter of 2007. Early in 2007, the Board also approved eight (8) District Plans for School Intervention that were developed following a Department led series of training sessions in the summer of 2006 for school and district leaders from these eight schools. These were focused on the development and implementation of standards based teaching and learning. These districts included Randolph (Randolph Community Middle), Holbrook (Holbrook Jr.-Sr. High), Gill Montague (Great Falls Middle), Springfield (Bowles and Lincoln Elementary), Chicopee (Fairview Middle), Westfield (South Middle), and New Bedford (Lincoln Elementary).

Throughout 2007, Department staff continued to engage with district and school leaders to support development of their district plans for school intervention. The Department also provided planning support in collaboration with highly qualified consultants in several districts where we did not have enough in-house capacity to provide necessary services.

In 2007, Department staff collaborated with district and school leaders in the development of a suite of tools designed to support the gathering and analysis of school level information. These tools, which are used by district and school leaders, provide both factual and perceptual information that informs local decision-making regarding improvement strategies. The tools include teacher and administrator surveys and report templates designed to align with the 10 essential conditions for school improvement, which are set out in the new regulations and highlight a school's current state in relation to those conditions. Together, the tools provide district leaders with school-based data and suggest areas for focused improvement that guide development of the district plan for school intervention.

Once completed, the *District Plan for School Intervention* is reviewed by a State Review Panel. The new regulations call for the Commissioner to appoint, and the Board of Education to approve, individuals with educational expertise and experience who will interact with district and school leaders in the review of these plans. This interaction affords local leaders the opportunity to discuss their analysis of issues and challenges at the school, propose the improvement strategies they have selected and engage in a discussion with experienced educational experts to "test" their decisions.

Districts with newly identified Commonwealth Priority Schools receive grant awards to support implementation of school improvement initiatives. These grants are funded by a combination of federal and state funds. Funds may be used for salaries, stipends, contracts, consultants, materials and travel for training to support planning and professional development identified in the school improvement plans. Funds granted for use in the 2007-2008 school year are being used to pay teacher stipends to work after school on development of improvement plans, including data analysis and action

planning. Additionally, funding is provided to pay substitutes so that teacher teams convene regularly to examine cumulative evidence of plan implementation and review benchmark data including assessment results. Stipends are paid to teachers participating in professional development to interpret formative assessment results and to learn how to use these results to differentiate instruction for students in their classrooms. In 2007, funds were also dedicated to provide a differential pay incentive for two principals serving at "chronically underperforming" schools.

Implementation Guidance and Support

Once a district's plan for improving student performance in a Commonwealth Priority School has been accepted by the Board of Education, the school has two years to implement the plan to improve student performance. During that time, the Department's School and District Intervention staff members are assigned to provide ongoing oversight and support, making periodic visits to the district to meet with leaders and staff and observe planned initiatives underway in the district's Commonwealth Priority School. Information is collected from classroom observations, as well as from observations of professional development activities, coaching sessions, data review and analysis activities. These on-site visits enable state targeted assistance staff to assess how the implementation of improvement initiatives is unfolding and offer assistance to address whatever concerns may surface. The information and data gathered during school visits are collected and analyzed, and aggregated results are provided to the school and district in the form of a written report. The written feedback reports include specific next steps for the school, district and state to support continuous improvement. Follow up visits and assistance activities take place throughout the 24-month period after a district's plan for school improvement is approved by the Board of Education.

In 2007, implementation guidance and support was provided to 57 schools in 16 districts. Depending on enrollment, these schools have received between $8,000 and $15,000, in school improvement funding through a combination of state and federal resources.

Leadership Development Training and Support

In 2005, the Department launched a partnership with the National Institute for School Leadership (NISL), a subsidiary of the National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE) to provide high quality training and support for selected Massachusetts principals in the tenants of instructional leadership. This effort began with the participation of two specific cohorts of educators: the first was a group of 55 state-selected principals, superintendents and consultants working in urban districts. This group completed the 18-month training program and members were certified as NISL trainers. In September 2006, these certified trainers began implementation

of a state-wide delivery plan of regional NISL training to eight new cohorts of educators; 240 principals, superintendents and central office level administrators representing 25 districts engaged in this training effort during that year.

The second cohort was designed to specifically address the development of instructional leaders in the state's first *underperforming* district. This cohort included the Holyoke Superintendent, all Holyoke Public Schools principals, and central office staff responsible for providing leadership in teaching and learning. The Department is currently providing district and school leaders with the services of a NISL coach to ensure deep implementation of the NISL training.

The MA DOE/NISL executive leadership program, now in its third year, is currently serving a total of 22 regional cohorts of close to 700 participants, including principals, superintendents and other district leadership personnel. Principals and members of the leadership teams in many of the state's 114 Commonwealth Priority Schools are taking advantage of this opportunity to receive state funded high quality leadership training through the MA DOE/NISL training initiative. More information is available at http://www.ncee.org/nisl/index.jsp?setProtocol=true

Follow-up Panel Reviews

Two years after a district with a school declared to be a Commonwealth Priority School begins implementing its Board approved plan for improving student performance at the school, a follow-up panel review is conducted to assess the school's progress. After considering the follow-up panel's findings, the Department determines 1) whether the school appears to have effectively implemented plans leading to improved student performance, and 2) whether the conditions are in place to sustain improvement. The Commissioner uses these reports, along with other student performance data, to determine whether the school will exit its status of *underperforming* - now designated as Commonwealth Priority Schools - or be recommended to the Board for a determination of *chronically underperforming*, giving the school "Priority 1 status".

Depending on the findings in the two-year follow-up review report, a *Commonwealth Priority School* that has shown significant progress in improving student performance may exit Commonwealth Priority School status. A school that has implemented its plan with reasonable fidelity but shown only minimal improvement may be retained in Commonwealth Priority School status to ensure continued state oversight and support. A school that has been unable to successfully implement the improvement initiatives in the plan and where students did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) may be recommended to the Board of Education for a determination of *chronic underperformance.* To date, five schools have exited underperforming status, the Roosevelt Middle School and Mt. Pleasant Elementary School in New Bedford, the Maurice Donahue Elementary School in Holyoke, the E.J. Harrington Elementary School in Lynn, and the Laurel Lake Elementary School in Fall River.

Reports submitted to the Commissioner from each stage of the School Performance Evaluation Process, including School Panel Review Reports, Fact finding Reports, and Two-Year Follow-up Review Reports are available on the Department of Education web site by cohort year at http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/review/

III. Chronically Underperforming Schools

When a school fails to demonstrate significant improvement in student performance within two years of acceptance of a remedial plan by the Board, the Board may declare the school to be *chronically underperforming*. To date, three schools have been identified as chronically underperforming. Subject to recently proposed changes in regulations on underperforming schools and school districts, chronically underperforming schools are now designated as Commonwealth Priority Schools "Priority 1 Status". In each school, significant improvements are evidenced in the 2007 MCAS results, expectations of student learning have risen, teachers are focused on strategies to improve their practice, and school-community engagement has become a priority.
The schools are listed in the table below.

School	District	Date of Determination	# of Students	# of Teachers Receiving PD	Cost
Matthew Kuss Middle School	Fall River	October 2004	495	63	$150,000 + principal hiring bonus of $19, 710
Henry Lord Middle School	Fall River	September 2005	710	50	$150,000 + principal hiring bonus of $20,310
William Peck Middle School	Holyoke	October 2005	248	60	Covered in Holyoke contract with America's Choice contract

The Department has contracted with America's Choice to provide turn-around partner services to these three schools.

Matthew Kuss Middle School – Fall River
The Kuss Middle School was initially identified as underperforming in 2000 and was determined to be chronically underperforming by the Board in 2004. The Department recruited an experienced principal who was hired by the district and began her leadership work at the Lord Middle School in the 2005-2006 school year. At the same time, the Department initiated the services of America's Choice as the school's turnaround partner and implementation of the school reform model began.

Over the last two years, teachers and leaders in the school have focused on effective implementation of the America's Choice curriculum and the workshop model. The Kuss School has participated in the state's Expanded Learning Time initiative, increasing the school day by approximately two hours four days a week. The leadership team at the school has paid particular attention to developing and maintaining effective

communication, both within the school and in outreach to parents and community. As part of the school redesign process, the leadership team has also focused on improving school climate and student conduct and a plan is now in place to establish teachers as student mentors, supported by intervention strategies for individual students.

In 2007, the Kuss Middle School made AYP in both ELA and mathematics for students in the aggregate. The school has no NCLB status in ELA and is in *Restructuring* for subgroups in mathematics. Improvement ratings indicate that the school is *on target* in both content areas. Performance ratings place the school in the *moderate* range in ELA and in the *very low* range in mathematics.

Improvement in student achievement appears to be the result of strong and focused instructional leadership, a collaborative, school-wide approach to using data to make decisions for improving student learning and differentiating teaching practice, heightened parent and community involvement, and a deliberate focus on school redesign in order to create more time for students to access and master the curriculum. A second year of positive AYP findings will move the school out of NCLB status in mathematics and sustain the current status in ELA.

Henry Lord Middle School – Fall River

The Henry Lord Middle School was identified as underperforming in 2002 and determined to be chronically underperforming by the Board in 2005. The district placed an interim principal in the school for the 2005-06 school year. The Department recruited an experienced principal who was hired by the district and began her leadership work at the Lord Middle School in the 2006-07 school year. At the same time, the Department initiated the services of America's Choice as the school's turnaround partner and implementation of the school reform model began.

Over the last year, under the new principal's leadership the Lord Middle School has undergone significant change. The establishment and training of school-based data teams has informed revision of the School Improvement Plan and implementation of the new improvement initiatives. An aggressive professional development plan has been created and training is being delivered to teachers during the school day, after school and on Saturdays. This training has been focused on changing instructional practice in literacy and mathematics, and has been grounded in the America's Choice workshop model.

In 2006-07, teachers at the Lord School participated in over 70 hours of professional development in differentiated teaching and learning, critical thinking and strategies for vocabulary development for middle grade students. Policies and procedures have been put in place to ensure efficient and orderly operation of the school. School administrators, teachers and consultants conduct "Learning Walks" on a regular basis to identify effective teaching practices and inform on-going technical assistance. During the 2006-2007 school year, teacher attendance at the Lord School rose from 91% to 94%, the highest attendance rate of any school in the district.

In preparation for the 2007-08 school year, the principal developed and submitted a customized plan to support and expand the school's improvement agenda. This plan

refocuses the role of America's Choice and extends direct coaching/mentoring work with teachers to include the services of other consultants and programs.

In 2007, the Lord School made AYP for students in the aggregate in both ELA and mathematics. The school remains in *Restructuring* status in both subjects, needing a second consecutive year of positive AYP findings in order to exit status. Improvement ratings indicate that the school is *on target* in both content areas. Performance ratings place the school in the *moderate* range in ELA and in the *very low* range in mathematics. Improvement in student achievement appears to be the result of strong and focused instructional leadership, a collaborative, school-wide approach to using data to make decisions for teaching and learning, and frequent, consistent support for teachers to make improvements in their teaching practices.

In the case of Fall River, where the district faced extraordinary difficulty in attracting highly qualified, experienced principals for two *chronically underperforming* schools, the Department provided a significant financial incentive to attract, hire and retain these school leaders. An annual $25,000 grant to supplement the district's negotiated salary rate for each principal was made available to support the hiring and retention of the current principals at each of the two schools.

William Peck Middle School – Holyoke

The William Peck Middle School was initially identified as underperforming in 2002 and determined to be chronically underperforming by the Board in 2005. At that time, the principal retired and the district elevated an assistant principal to the leadership position in the school. The Department contracted with America's Choice as the district's turnaround partner and the implementation of the school reform model began at the Peck School.

Over the last two years, the principal, school leadership team members and teachers have been trained to analyze student performance data and student work samples against rubric criteria and benchmark papers. District-wide efforts have produced performance standards in ELA and mathematics that the school uses to guide this work. The Readers/Writers Workshop model has guided the school's focus on literacy and teachers use an extended literacy block to implement a four-part class period that includes independent reading, read aloud/think aloud, work period (writing lessons, small group reading lessons, independent work), and a closing. Teachers are focusing on attaining consistency across all levels in the literacy instructional model. A continuing challenge for the school is the need to attract highly qualified mathematics teachers and teachers skilled in working with a wide range of beginning English Language Learners.

In 2007, the Peck School made AYP in ELA but not in mathematics. The school is in *Corrective Action* for subgroups in ELA and in *Restructuring* for mathematics. Performance ratings are *Moderate* in ELA and *Very Low* in mathematics. Improvement ratings indicate the school is *Above Target* in ELA and *Improved Below Target* in mathematics.

Commonwealth Pilot Schools

At the November 2006 Board of Education meeting, the Board considered a proposal to convert four schools to Commonwealth Pilot School rather than determine these schools to be c*hronically underperforming*: The English High School in Boston; Academy Middle School in Fitchburg; Duggan Middle School in Springfield and Putnam Vocational Technical School in Springfield. The Board's intent for the Commonwealth Pilot Schools is to promote greater school autonomy while also complying with the stricter accountability expectations that would accompany a declaration of *chronic underperformance*. The Department has engaged the Center for Collaborative Education to provide technical assistance, training and support to district and school leaders of these four underperforming schools through their conversion to Commonwealth Pilot School status. At the February 2007 meeting, the Board approved proposals to convert the four schools into Commonwealth Pilot Schools.

In summer 2007, we engaged The University of Massachusetts' Donahue Institute to evaluate the initial stage of the initiative. This fall, we again offered the Commonwealth Pilot School conversion opportunity to superintendents of districts with Commonwealth Priority Schools. One school, the Homer Street School in Springfield, is currently planning for conversion to Commonwealth Pilot School status for fall 2008. We are currently exploring the possibility of sponsoring a School Redesign and Restructuring Institute in which districts, school leaders and union leadership will have the opportunity to tackle issues of school redesign and restructuring at the district level.

IV. Intervention in Underperforming Districts

District performance review under NCLB is the responsibility of the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (EQA). The Office was created by the Massachusetts Legislature in July of 2000, to provide independent and objective programmatic and financial audits of the 350-plus school districts which serve the cities and towns of Massachusetts. In cases where EQA finds district performance to be below acceptable standards, the Education Management Audit Council (EMAC), EQA's governing Board, may refer a district for Department and State Board of Education action regarding a designation as an *underperforming* district. This fiscal year, Gill-Montague and Randolph have been referred by EMAC for Department and Board action.

Underperforming Districts

To date, five Massachusetts districts have been declared by the Board of Education to be underperforming; they are listed in the chart below. In the case of Holyoke, Winchendon and Southbridge, the Department has engaged third-party "turn-around partners" to assist with each of these districts to support the planning and implementation of Board-approved improvement initiatives. In Gill-Montague and Randolph, the Department conducted district leadership evaluations in 2007. Results of these evaluations will be bought forward to the Commissioner and Board at the March 2008 Board meeting for discussion and determination of next steps with regard to state support.

District	Date of determination	# of students	# of Teachers receiving PD	Cost
Holyoke	November 2003	6,485	220	$1,146,750
Winchendon	November 2003	1,754	135	$139,616
Southbridge	September 2004	2,286	176	$154,064
Gill-Montague	June 2007	1,179	N/A	$6,810
Randolph	November 2007	3,450	N/A	$10,600

Holyoke

The Department engaged the services of the America's Choice program to support and expand the Board-approved turnaround plan for the Holyoke Public Schools. America's Choice officials worked closely with Department staff and Holyoke leaders to design a comprehensive implementation plan and to guide and support the district's improvement work. The district's capacity to collect, manage and analyze data has improved significantly. A focus on instructional leadership at the district and school levels has been supported through the NISL training. A fulltime America's Choice Assistant to the Superintendent has been supported by the Department's grant to Holyoke. A new and defined vision for the district's expectations of staff, students, parents and the community and their respective roles in the improvement effort has evolved. Holyoke teachers have

participated in literacy and mathematics training. Leadership training and coaching has been provided to teams in every school. The Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (EQA) conducted a follow up review in the district in May of 2007. The focus of the review was to assess the district's implementation of its turnaround plan and determine improvement. The Board will schedule a meeting in the winter in Holyoke to review follow up review and results and determine next steps in the state's intervention plan. In 2007, the district did not make AYP for students in the aggregate in either ELA or mathematics and remains in *corrective action* accountability status for both subjects.

Winchendon

The Department appointed an Interim Superintendent for the Winchendon Public Schools in January 2004 to provide leadership for the district as the School Committee conducted a search for a permanent leader. In the fall of 2004, a new Superintendent was hired. With the new Superintendent's input, the Department contracted with the Education Development Center (EDC) to provide services, training and guidance to the district as implementation of the improvement initiatives outlined in the Board-approved turnaround plan got underway. The district has focused on the development of strong systems for establishing and supervising changes in instructional practices at all levels and in all schools. Teachers throughout the system have engaged in training to differentiate instruction for student learners and significant work has been completed in curriculum alignment in both ELA and mathematics. District leaders have also focused time and effort on developing productive relations with town officials. The Department has provided Winchendon school and district leaders with the opportunity to participate in the National Institute for School Leadership (NISL) training during the 2006-2007 School Year. The program's focus on the development of leadership for improved instruction supports the district's improvement plan.

The EQA Office conducted a follow-up review in the district in January 2007. The focus of the review was to assess the district's implementation of its turnaround plan and to determine improvement. The Board will discuss the Winchendon follow up review report at its March 2008 meeting.

Southbridge

The Department appointed an Interim Superintendent for the Southbridge Public Schools in March 2005 to provide leadership for the district as the School Committee conducted a search for a permanent leader. In August of 2005, a new Superintendent was hired. The new leader developed the district's turnaround plan, which was approved by the Board in December 2005. The Department appointed a team of two retired superintendents to guide and oversee the plan's implementation. A strong focus on curriculum development and alignment was the primary initiative. The Superintendent has provided leadership by building the district's capacity with a major technology enhancement effort and an emphasis on using student performance data to guide improvement.

The EQA Office conducted a follow-up review in Southbridge in January 2007. The focus of the review was to assess the district's implementation of its turnaround plan and to determine improvement. Once the final follow up report is received, the Board will review it and determine next steps in the state's intervention plan.

Gill-Montague

In June 2007, the Board declared that the Gill-Montague Regional School District (GMRSD) to be underperforming. As a result of that determination, the Department engaged a three-member team of independent evaluators to conduct an onsite District Leadership Review. In October 2007, using an established protocol, the review team assessed the strengths of the Superintendent, the School Committee, key central office staff and building-level leaders in order to determine whether components of district leadership must be adjusted or supported to ensure the likelihood of significant improvement. As well, the review team engaged teachers, parents and community leaders in interviews and focus group discussions to gain a more complete perspective on leadership capacity for the district and its schools. The Board received the report in November 2007. Gill-Montague is in the process of preparing an improvement plan for Board review and approval at the March 2008 Board meeting.

Randolph

In November 2007, the Board determined the Randolph School District to be underperforming. As a result of that determination, the Department engaged a three-member team of independent evaluators to conduct an onsite District Leadership Review in December 2007. Using an established protocol, the review team assessed the strengths of the Superintendent, the School Committee, key central office staff and building-level leaders in order to determine whether components of district leadership must be adjusted or supported to ensure the likelihood of significant improvement. As well, the review team engaged teachers, parents and community leaders in interviews and focus group discussions to gain a more complete perspective on leadership capacity for the district and its schools. The MA Board of Education is expected to review and act upon the Randolph District leadership review team's report and recommendations at the Board's March 2008 regular meeting.

V. Identification and Recognition of schools showing significant improvement

Compass Schools
The Department also uses the School and District Accountability System to identify schools showing significant improvement in their students' performance in English Language Arts and Mathematics, and designates them as *Commonwealth Compass Schools*. In February of 2007, based on the MA School and District Accountability System's fall 2006 results, 35 schools were selected as Commonwealth Compass Schools. In addition to special recognition at a public event at the Great Hall of the State House, each of the *2007 Compass Schools* received a $2,500 grant. Those schools are listed in Attachment E. Again this year, we will identify a cohort of Compass Schools and will notify and recognize them in the spring.

Since the program began in 2001, 95 schools have been designated as *Commonwealth Compass Schools*. They include elementary, middle, vocational, and comprehensive high schools across the state.

Schools no longer carrying an AYP status under NCLB
This year, for the first time we are awarding "Sustaining Success Grants" to schools demonstrating significant progress, i.e., those that have made AYP for two consecutive years. We estimate that a total of $75,000 will be made available to 5 schools (approximately $15,000 per school). These funds are intended to support the continuation of the instructional practices and initiatives that enabled the school to show significant improvement leading to removal of AYP status.

VI. FY08 Intervention Account Budget and FY08 Budget Recommendations

During FY08 the Department of Education has focused its targeted assistance efforts to underperforming schools on the 114 schools designated as Commonwealth Priority Schools in the fall of 2007 and on assistance provided aimed at building the capacity of the nine Commissioner's Districts and the five Underperforming Districts.

Current funding levels have enabled us to partially address these top priorities. No school-level targeted assistance has been available for the 490 other schools currently in corrective action that are not Commonwealth Priority Schools.

The Department's FY09 budget request of $39.1 million would allow it to address more intensively the needs of the Commonwealth Priority Schools and highest priority school districts, and would also allow us to begin to develop capacity in the smaller urban districts and through regional entities to provide school-level assistance to the other schools in corrective action.

An FY09 appropriation of $13.8 million would allow the Department to increase the level of assistance to the current priority areas but would not enable us to provide assistance to the 490 other schools in corrective action currently receiving no direct assistance through this appropriation.

A summary of the Department's plan for expenditure of FY08 Intervention and Targeted Assistance account funds are included as Attachment E and F. Attachment E provides spending information by initiative. Attachment F provides spending information by subsidiary area.

The Department's FY09 budgetary recommendations for intervention and targeted assistance efforts (for account 7061-9408) are set forth in Attachment G.

VII. Appendix

Attachment A: 2007 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Data – Massachusetts School and District Accountability Status

Attachment B: Sample Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) District Report for Revere and Sample Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) School Report for Garfield Elementary School in Revere

Attachment C: Regulations on Underperforming Schools and School Districts

Attachment D: 2007 Commonwealth Compass Schools

Attachment E: FY 08 School and District Intervention Account Spending by Initiative

Attachment F: FY 08 School and District Intervention Account Spending by Subsidiary

Attachment G: FY 09 School and District Intervention Account Request

Attachment A1

2007 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Data - Massachusetts District Accountability Status

Total Districts = 238

DISTRICT Accountability History	2004	2005	2006	2007	
	#	#	#	#	%
Corrective Action - Aggregate	-	-	9	9	3.8
Identified for Improvement - Aggregate	6	10	0	0	0.0
Subtotal	**6**	**10**	**9**	**9**	**3.8**
Corrective Action - Subgroups	-	-	18	27	11.3
Identified for Improvement - Subgroups	123	145	105	11	4.6
Total	**129**	**155**	**132**	**47**	**19.7**

2007					
New ID	Exited	Subject Area Identified			
#	#	ELA Only	Math Only	Both	Total
0	0	7	1	1	9
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	**0**	**7**	**1**	**1**	**9**
0	0	4	10	13	27
0	86	7	1	3	11
0	**86**	**18**	**12**	**17**	**47**

DISTRICT AYP Determinations	2007					
	Districts Identified for Improvement or Corrective Action for SUBGROUPS (38 Total)					
	2007 AYP Determinations - Subgroup AYP = No					
	Grades 3 - 5		Grades 6 - 8		Grades 9 - 12	
Student Subgroup (40 or more students)	#	%	#	%	#	%
Special Education	30	78.9	31	81.6	24	63.2
Low Income	21	55.3	21	55.3	20	52.6
White	15	39.5	10	26.3	4	10.5
Hispanic	15	39.5	12	31.6	16	42.1
Limited English Proficient	17	44.7	16	42.1	8	21.1
African American/Black	12	31.6	7	18.4	5	13.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	5	13.2	1	2.6	1	2.6
Native American	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Notes:

Percentages are out of the total number of districts included (n=238 for number of districts receiving AYP determinations)

The 'New ID' figure indicates the number of districts that newly gained a particular Accountability Status in 2007.

The 'Exited' figure indicates the number of districts that exited their 2006 Accountability Status by making AYP in the identified subject area for two consecutive years.

The 'Districts Identified for Improvement or Corrective Action for Subgroups' table indicates for districts with one or more negative AYP finding which subgroups did not make AYP in 2007 by gradespan.

2007 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Data - Massachusetts School Accountability Status

SCHOOL Accountability Status	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
Total Schools: 1792	#	#	#	#	#	#	%
Restructuring - Aggregate	--	--	24	30	60	77	4.3
Corrective Action - Aggregate	--	38	28	37	49	25	1.4
Identified for Improvement - Aggregate	208	168	128	131	208	201	11.2
Subtotal	**208**	**206**	**180**	**198**	**317**	**303**	**16.9**
Restructuring - Subgroups	--	--	--		--	114	6.4
Corrective Action - Subgroups	--	--	--	--	139	92	5.1
Identified for Improvement - Subgroups	--	--	193	222	174	164	9.2
Total	**208**	**206**	**373**	**420**	**630**	**673**	**37.6**

2007									
New ID	Exited	Subject Area Identified				AYP			Title I Schools
#	#	ELA Only	Math Only	Both	Total	Yes	No	No 2007 Findings	
--	0	19	41	17	77	11	66	0	64
--	1	13	11	1	25	12	12	1	21
29	6	121	47	33	201	91	109	1	166
29	**7**	**153**	**99**	**51**	**303**	**114**	**187**	**2**	**251**
--	0	26	59	29	114	2	112	0	70
--	0	27	59	6	92	36	56	0	56
31	10	59	80	25	164	60	104	0	89
60	**17**	**265**	**297**	**111**	**673**	**212**	**459**	**2**	**466**

SCHOOL AYP Determinations	Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action or Restructuring for SUBGROUPS (370 Total)			
	2007 AYP Determinations - Subgroup AYP = No			
Student Subgroup (40 or more students)	1 No	> 1 No	Total	%
Limited English Proficient	3	68	71	19%
Special Education	56	149	205	55%
Low Income	27	158	185	50%
African American/Black	2	49	51	14%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	9	10	3%
Hispanic	7	101	108	29%
Native American	0	0	0	0%
White	4	52	56	15%

Notes:
A district or school must make AYP for two consecutive years to exit an Accountability Status. A positive AYP determination in 2007 indicates that a district or school will exit its Accountability Status in 2008 if it continues to make AYP.

A 'Yes' finding in Column Q indicates the school made AYP for all student groups in the identified subject area(s).

The 'New ID' figure in Column K indicates the number of schools that newly gained a particular Accountability Status in 2007. 60 schools with no 2006 Accountability status were identified for improvement for the first time in 2007. (29 for improvement in the aggregate and 31 for improvement in the subgroups.)

The 'Exited' figure in Column L indicates the number of schools that exited their 2006 Accountability Status by making AYP in the identified subject area for two consecutive years.

Title I schools are those schools receiving federal Title I funds in the 2007-08 school year.

In the 'Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action or Restructuring for Subgroups' table, 1 No (Column C) indicates for schools with one negative subgroup finding which subgroup did not make AYP in 2007. '>1 No' (Column E) indicates for schools with more than one negative AYP finding which subgroups did not make AYP in 2007.

Revere - 2007 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Data

District: Revere (02480000)
Title I District: Yes

2007 AYP Data - Summary

	NCLB Accountability Status	Performance Rating	Improvement Rating
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS	Corrective Action - Subgroups	High	On Target
MATHEMATICS	No Status	Moderate	Improved Below Target

A district will be newly identified for improvement if it fails to make AYP in the same subject area and all grade-spans, for students in the aggregate or any subgroup, for two consecutive years. A district will have no accountability status if it makes AYP in the same subject area for at least one grade-span for two consecutive years.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Grade Spans		2006	2007	2007 Subgroups Not Making AYP
Grades 3-5	Aggregate	Yes	Yes	Special Education -
	All Subgroups	No	No	
Grades 6-8	Aggregate	No	Yes	Special Education -
	All Subgroups	No	No	
Grades 9-12	Aggregate	Yes	Yes	Hispanic/Latino -
	All Subgroups	Yes	No	

MATHEMATICS

Grade Spans		2006	2007	2007 Subgroups Not Making AYP
Grades 3-5	Aggregate	Yes	Yes	Special Education -
	All Subgroups	No	No	
Grades 6-8	Aggregate	No	No	White -Special Education -Low Income -F/LEP -
	All Subgroups	No	No	
Grades 9-12	Aggregate	Yes	Yes	
	All Subgroups	Yes	Yes	

Adequate Yearly Progress History											NCLB Accountability Status
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
ELA	**Aggregate**	-	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Corrective Action - Subgroups
	All Subgroups	-	-	-	-	No	No	No	Yes	No	
MATH	**Aggregate**	-	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No Status
	All Subgroups	-	-	-	-	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	

Garfield Elementary School - 2007 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Data

District: Revere (02480000)
School: Garfield Elementary School (02480056)
School Title I Status: Title I School (TA)
NCLB School Choice Required: No
Supplemental Educational Services Required: No

2007 AYP Data - Summary

	NCLB Accountability Status	Performance Rating	Improvement Rating
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS	No Status	High	On Target
MATHEMATICS	No Status	Moderate	On Target

To make adequate yearly progress in 2007, a student group must meet (A) a student participation requirement, either (B) the Stateâ€™s 2007 performance target for that subject or (C) the groupâ€™s own 2007 improvement target, and (D) an additional attendance or graduation requirement.

Student Group	(A) Participation Did at least 95% of students participate in MCAS?		(B) Performance Did student group meet or exceed state performance target?		(C) Improvement Did student group meet or exceed its own improvement target?		(D) Attendance Did student group meet 92% attendance (G1-8) or 55% graduation rate target (G9-12)?		
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS	**MetTarget**	**Actual**	**MetTarget(85.4)**	**Actual**	**MetTarget**	**Change from 2006**	**MetTarget**	**Actual**	**AYP 2007**
Aggregate	Yes	100	No	80.4	Yes	4.4	Yes	96.3	Yes
Lim. English Prof.	Yes	98	No	70.5	Yes	9.2	Yes	96.7	Yes
Special Education	-	-	-	66.2	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	Yes	100	No	78.8	Yes	4.3	Yes	96.2	Yes
Afr. Amer./Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	Yes	100	No	81.9	Yes	1.0	Yes	97.7	Yes
Hispanic	Yes	100	No	80.6	Yes	5.6	Yes	95.9	Yes
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	Yes	100	No	77.5	Yes	3.7	Yes	95.6	Yes
MATHEMATICS	**MetTarget**	**Actual**	**MetTarget(76.5)**	**Actual**	**MetTarget**	**Change from 2006**	**MetTarget**	**Actual**	**AYP 2007**
Aggregate	Yes	100	Yes	79.7	Yes	5.4	Yes	96.3	Yes
Lim. English Prof.	Yes	100	No	72.7	Yes	7.1	Yes	96.7	Yes
Special Education	-	-	-	67.4	-	-	-	-	-
Low Income	Yes	100	Yes	78.2	Yes	5.2	Yes	96.2	Yes
Afr. Amer./Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	Yes	100	Yes	81.9	Yes	0.1	Yes	97.7	Yes
Hispanic	Yes	100	Yes	80.4	Yes	7.8	Yes	95.9	Yes
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	Yes	100	Yes	77.5	Yes	4.4	Yes	95.6	Yes

Adequate Yearly Progress History											NCLB Accountability Status
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
ELA	Aggregate	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No Status
	All Subgroups	-	-	-	-	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	
MATH	Aggregate	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No Status
	All Subgroups	-	-	-	-	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	

Education Laws and Regulations

603 CMR 2.00:
Underperforming Schools and School Districts

Section:

2.01: Authority, Scope, and Purpose
2.02: Definitions
2.03: School Accountability
2.04: Underperforming School Districts
2.05: Low-Performing Mathematics Programs
View All Sections

Adopted by the Board of Education: June 16, 1997
Most Recently Amended by the Board of Education: October 24, 2006

2.01: Authority, Scope and Purpose

(1) 603 CMR 2.00 is promulgated pursuant to the authority of the Board of Education under M.G.L. c.69, §§ 1B and 1J and c. 71, § 38G.

(2) 603 CMR 2.00 governs the Board's review of the adequacy of the educational opportunities and services provided by the Commonwealth's public schools, and identifies the circumstances under which the Board may declare a school or school district chronically underperforming and intervene in accordance with M.G.L. c. 69, §§ 1J and 1K. 603 CMR 2.00 also governs the Board's review of the mathematics programs provided by the Commonwealth's public school's and identifies circumstances under which the Board may declare a school's mathematics program low-performing and require mathematics teachers in that program to take a diagnostic mathematics content assessment.

2.02: Definitions

Accountability Status shall mean the category to which a school is assigned, based on its AYP determinations over multiple years, to define the required course of school, district and/or state action that must be taken to improve student performance. Accountability status categories include Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action and Restructuring. Schools that make AYP in a subject for all student groups for two or more consecutive years are assigned to the No Status category. A district or school may be placed in an accountability status on the basis of the performance and improvement profile of students in the aggregate or of one or more student subgroups over two or more years in English language arts and/or mathematics.

Adequate Yearly Process or AYP shall mean a determination by the Department of the adequacy of district, grade level, school, and student subgroup performance and improvement relative to performance and improvement targets in English language arts and mathematics established by the Board in accordance with the No Child Left Behind Act.

Board shall mean the Board of Education, appointed in accordance with M.G.L. c. 15, § 1E.

Chronically Underperforming School shall mean a school deemed by the Commissioner to be an underperforming school, also known as a Commonwealth Priority School, that is found by the Board, in accordance with M.G.L. c. 69, § 1J, to have failed to demonstrate significant improvement consistent with its approved remedial plan within 24 months after Board approval of its plan.

Commissioner shall mean the Commissioner of Education, appointed in accordance with M.G.L. c. 15, § 1F, or his or her designee.

Commonwealth Priority School shall mean a school that the Commissioner has deemed to be underperforming within the meaning of M.G.L. c. 69, § 1J.

Core academic subjects shall mean the subjects specified in M.G.L. c. 69, § 1D (mathematics, science and technology, history and social science, English, foreign languages and the arts) and subjects covered in courses that are part of an approved vocational-technical education program under M.G.L. c. 74.

Corrective Action shall mean the Accountability Status of a school that has failed to meet AYP in English language arts, mathematics, or both subjects in the aggregate or for student subgroups for four consecutive years or for two or more non-consecutive years while in Identified for Improvement accountability status.

Department shall mean the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education acting through the Commissioner or his designee.

District or school district shall mean a municipal school department or regional school district, acting through its school committee or superintendent of schools; a county agricultural school, acting through its board of trustees or superintendent/director; a charter school, acting through its board of trustees or school leader; or any other public school established by statute or charter, acting through its governing board or director.

District Review shall mean a review conducted by the office of Educational Quality and Accountability to determine whether a district is making adequate provision for the delivery of a high quality education to all students served by the district, and whether the district is making effective and efficient use of available resources to improve the educational outcomes attained by students attending the district's schools. District reviews shall be based on performance standards adopted by the EMAC. The Office of **Educational Quality and Accountability** shall publish and provide district officials with written guidelines for District reviews.

District Review Teams shall mean a group of individuals appointed by the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability to conduct desk based and/or on site school and district performance review activities.

Educational Management Audit Council or "EMAC" shall mean the entity, comprised of individuals appointed by the Governor pursuant to M.G.L. c. 15, § 55A that directs and oversees the conduct of school and district audits performed by the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability.

Fact-Finding Review shall mean a review conducted by one or more individuals appointed by the Commissioner in accordance with M.G. L. c. 69, §1J or 1K to assess the reasons for a school's or district's underperformance and prospects for its improvement.

Identified for Improvement shall mean the Accountability Status of a school that has failed to meet AYP in English language arts or math or both subjects in the aggregate or for student subgroups for two consecutive years.

Low-performing Mathematics Program: A mathematics program in a Massachusetts public middle or high school that has been identified as low-performing according to the criteria found in 603 CMR 2.05.

Mathematics Content Assessment: A diagnostic assessment of mathematics content knowledge designated by the Board and paid for by the Department.

Mathematics Teacher: Any educator who teaches any mathematics course in a Massachusetts public school.

NCLB shall mean the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. 6301, et. seq.

Office of Educational Quality and Accountability or "EQA" shall mean the agency established pursuant to M.G. L. c. 15, § 55A.

Restructuring shall mean the Accountability Status of a school that has failed to make AYP in English language arts, mathematics, or both subjects in the aggregate or for student subgroups for five or more consecutive years or for one or more additional years after being identified for Corrective Action.

School shall mean a single public school, consisting of one or more school buildings, which operates under the direct administration of a principal, director, or school leader appointed by the school district or charter school board responsible for its governance.

State Review Panel shall mean a group of highly qualified individuals appointed to serve, on request, as advisors to the Commissioner and Board on matters related to school and district performance review and improvement planning.

2.03: School Accountability

(1) The Department shall implement an accountability system approved by the Board to track the performance and improvement demonstrated by Massachusetts public schools on State assessments in designated core academic subjects and other measures of performance approved by the Board on recommendation of the Commissioner. The school accountability system implemented by the Department shall be designed to meet federal as well as state statutory requirements.

(a) The school accountability system shall measure performance referenced to Board-approved state targets for student performance on MCAS tests and alternative assessments in English language arts and mathematics, high school graduation rate, and student attendance.

(b) In addition to state targets for MCAS performance which in a given year are the same for all schools, the Department shall establish subject-specific MCAS improvement targets on an annual basis for each school, and for each student subgroup within a school.

(c) The Department shall compile and analyze the performance and improvement data for each school and district, together with data on MCAS participation, student attendance, and high school graduation rates on an annual basis to determine, for each school, whether students in the aggregate and student subgroups within the school have made adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward the achievement of state performance targets.

(d) The Department shall communicate AYP and accountability status determinations to school and district officials and the public on an annual basis as soon as practicable after annual MCAS results become available, and shall inform school and district officials of any state actions that may occur as a consequence of those determinations.

(2) The Commissioner shall recruit highly qualified individuals to serve as members of a State Review Panel.

(a) The Commissioner shall select Review Panel members on the basis of their demonstrated expertise in one or more of the following fields:

1. district or school leadership
2. standards-based elementary or secondary curriculum, instruction, and assessment
3. instructional data management and analysis
4. district, school, or program evaluation
5. educational program management

6. teacher leadership
7. organizational management
8. district or school budget and finance
9. any other fields that the Commissioner deems to be relevant to the review and evaluation of school or district performance or school improvement planning.

(b) The Commissioner shall deploy Review Panel members, individually or as a group, to conduct or participate in the review of school improvement plans and the evaluation of district improvement activities. Review Panel members may be asked to provide advice and assistance to the Commissioner and Board regarding the appropriateness and sufficiency of actions being taken by district and school leaders and by the Department to improve student performance in Commonwealth Priority Schools and Chronically Underperforming Schools.

(c) Candidates for appointment to the State Review Panel shall be approved by the Board.

(d) State Review Panel members may be compensated by the Department for their service.

(3) **Designation as a Commonwealth Priority School**

When a school is identified for Corrective Action or Restructuring in English language arts and/or mathematics for students in the aggregate as a result of failing, for four or more years, to make AYP in the same subject(s), the Commissioner shall designate the school a Commonwealth Priority School

(4) **Notice of Designation and Opportunity for Reconsideration**

(a) When a school is found to meet the criteria for designation as a Commonwealth Priority School, the Department will provide written notice to the governing body of the school, the district superintendent, if any, the school's principal, and the collective bargaining agent for the school's faculty, if any, informing them that the school is so designated.

(b) The governing body of a school designated as a Commonwealth Priority School may seek reconsideration of that designation if it believes that the designation was based upon erroneous or misleading information or that the school should not be so designated due to special circumstances. A request for reconsideration of a Commonwealth Priority School designation shall be accompanied by documentary support of the claim of error, offer of explanation, or statement of special circumstances, and must be received by the Commissioner no later than thirty (30) calendar days after the date the school received notification of its designation.

(c) The Department will not initiate state intervention in a school designated as a Commonwealth Priority School while a timely request for reconsideration is pending.

(d) The Commissioner's determination on reconsideration of a Commonwealth Priority School designation shall be final.

(5) **Fact Finding to Assess Intervention Required**

(a) Within thirty (30) days after the Commissioner issues a Commonwealth Priority School designation, the school committee and superintendent of a district in which a school so designated is located, or the board of trustees and head of school of a charter school so designated, shall submit a written self-assessment to the Department setting forth:

1. a succinct assessment of the extent to which the essential structures, policies, administrative practices and operating conditions for improving student performance in the school are in place, and
2. the school's needs for improvement assistance and support.

(b) District officials shall confer with teacher representatives in preparing this assessment and statement of needs.

(c) The Department may rely in whole or in part on information contained in the district self-assessment report to determine initially the school's need for service and support.

(d) Within thirty (30) days following Department receipt of a Commonwealth Priority School's self-assessment and statement of needs, the Department will initiate an independent fact finding review to assess the current capacity and willingness of district, school, and community leaders to plan for, lead, and productively engage the school's faculty, administrators, students, parents and community institutions in appropriate school improvement efforts, with or without assistance from an external partner.

(e) The Commissioner may appoint one or more members of the State Review Panel to consider the results of the fact finding review, the district's self-assessment and statement of needs, and other relevant information provided by the Department or solicited by panel members. The panel member(s) may recommend appropriate action to the Commissioner and Board based on their professional judgments regarding:

1. the present adequacy of leadership for change to improve results;
2. the present adequacy of district infrastructure to support school improvement;
3. the readiness and apparent capacity of school and district personnel to plan effectively and lead the implementation of appropriate actions to improve student achievement at the school;
4. the readiness and apparent capacity of district, school and faculty leaders to engage productively with and benefit from the assistance provided by an external partner;
5. the likelihood of positive returns on state investments of assistance and support to improve the school's performance within current management structure and staffing; and
6. the necessity that the school in question remain in operation to serve district students.

(f) The Commissioner, upon consideration of the recommendations of the State Review Panel members assigned to the case, shall determine the services and supports for which a Commonwealth Priority School will have priority. The school may be given priority for receipt of state-funded or arranged assistance and supports including, but not limited to:

1. financial support from the Department to support the successful implementation of district planned and directed improvement initiatives;
2. direct assistance from Department staff and consultants to support data analysis, program design, evaluation of curriculum and instructional practice, or school management;
3. school improvement planning, personnel recruitment, selection or evaluation, and budget planning assistance;
4. participation in state-sponsored leadership training and teacher professional development opportunities;
5. guidance, assistance and/or services from an external organizational partner engaged by the Department to support district systemic changes and/or school-based improvement initiatives

(6) **Improvement Planning and Reporting Requirements**

(a) The governing body of a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School shall adopt clear, rigorous performance expectations for raising the level of student achievement at the school. Such expectations shall include, but not be limited to, meeting school-wide Adequate Yearly Progress standards within two years after the adoption of a school improvement plan. The governing body shall adopt a written policy setting forth the manner in which the performance expectations it has established will be used in its personnel evaluation system.

(b) The governing body and administrators responsible for management of a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School shall ensure that essential infrastructure and conditions are in place to support the delivery of high quality, standards-based curriculum, instruction, assessment and student support services at the school.

(c) The governing body of a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming

School shall revise existing policies, structures, agreements, processes, and practices as needed to remove existing barriers to achievement of the conditions for effective teaching, learning and instructional management.

(d) In accordance with M.G.L. c. 69, § 1J, no more than six months after the school is declared to be a Commonwealth Priority School or a Chronically Underperforming School, the superintendent of the district in which the school is located, or in the case of a charter school, its head of school, shall submit to the Board the district's plan to improve the performance of students at the school. The improvement plan shall specify:

1. the immediate corrective actions that the district has taken and proposes to take to ensure that essential infrastructure and conditions for improved teaching, learning, and instructional management at the school are in place, and
2. the steps that will be followed by school administrators and faculty to develop and implement a coherent, intentional design for the delivery of effective teaching, learning, instructional management and student services at the school.

(e) The district's immediate term plan of corrective action to improve student performance in a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School shall describe the changes in the district's or school's existing policies, structures, agreements, processes, and practices necessary to ensure significant achievement gains for all students enrolled in such schools. All such plans must include the following elements, or a compelling rationale for alternative approaches designed to achieve comparable or superior results:

1. The school's principal has authority to select and assign staff to positions in the school without regard to seniority;
2. The school's principal has control over financial resources necessary to successfully implement the school improvement plan;
3. The school is implementing curricula that are aligned to state frameworks in core academic subjects;
4. The school implements systematically a program of interim assessments (4-6 times per year) in English language arts and mathematics that are aligned to school curriculum and state frameworks;
5. The school has a system to provide detailed tracking and analysis of assessment results and uses those results to inform curriculum, instruction and individual interventions;
6. The school schedule for student learning provides adequate time on a daily and weekly basis for the delivery of instruction and provision of individualized support as needed in English language arts and math, which for students not yet proficient is presumed to be at least 90 minutes per day in each subject;
7. The school provides daily after-school tutoring and homework help for students who need supplemental instruction and focused work on skill development;
8. The school has a least two full-time subject-area coaches, one each for English language arts/reading and for mathematics, who are responsible to provide faculty at the school with consistent classroom observation and feedback on the quality and effectiveness of curriculum delivery, instructional practice, and data use;
9. School administrators periodically evaluate faculty, including direct evaluation of applicable content knowledge and annual evaluation of overall performance tied in part to solid growth in student learning and commitment to the school's culture, educational model, and improvement strategy;
10. The weekly and annual work schedule for teachers provides adequate time for regular, frequent, department and/or grade-level faculty meetings to discuss individual student progress, curriculum issues, instructional practice, and school-wide improvement efforts. As a general rule no less than one hour per week shall be dedicated to leadership-directed, collaborative work, and no fewer than 5 days per year, or hours equivalent thereto, when teachers are not responsible for supervising or teaching

students, shall be dedicated to professional development and planning activities directed by school leaders.

(f) District officials, in developing a plan to improve the performance of a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School, shall consider the merits of contracting for third party management services or requesting Board approval of a Horace Mann charter to restructure governance of the school. The district's written submission to the Board, containing district leaders' improvement plan proposal, shall include a discussion of these options.

(g) The Commissioner will publish guidance to assist district administrators, school leaders, faculty, and staff of a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School with the organizational redesign aspect of the school improvement planning process referenced at 603 C.M.R. 2.03(6)(d) 2. The Department's guidance on school system design will identify elements of effective practice and conditions of organizational operation that have been demonstrated to be effective contributors to improved student performance in low performing schools.

(h) The Commissioner's published guidance on instructional and administrative policies, practices and conditions found to have positive effects on student performance shall serve as a basis for the Department's assessment of the adequacy of the policies, practices, and conditions in a school failing to meet performance expectations, and shall be the foundation for the school improvement planning and support provided by the Department.

(i) The Department will form a stakeholder working group to assist in the development and participate in periodic review and amendment of Department guidelines for the conduct of fact-finding reviews to determine the capacity and service needs of districts with schools designated as Commonwealth Priority Schools. The stakeholder working group shall include, but not be limited to, representatives from the professional associations of Massachusetts school committees, superintendents, principals, program administrators, teachers and parents. The Department will publish these guidelines in draft form for public review and comment prior to adoption and final publication.

(j) When the governing body of a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School submits, for Board approval, its plan for improving student performance, the Commissioner may appoint one or more members from the State Review Panel to review the proposed plan and recommend appropriate action to the Commissioner and Board.

(k) The Commissioner shall recommend to the Board, and the Board shall exercise its discretion to decide whether to accept, reject or direct that specific amendments be made to the plan submitted by a district to improve student performance at a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School. The Board's exercise of its plan approval authority shall be guided by the recommendations, if any, of any State Review Panel members designated by the Commissioner to review and advise on approval of proposed plans. In cases of Chronically Underperforming schools, the Board shall consider amending school improvement plans to require management of the school by a qualified third party, under a performance-based contract or Horace Mann charter.

(l) In January and July of each year, the governing body of a Commonwealth Priority School and a Chronically Underperforming School shall provide the Commissioner with a written report of the school's progress toward its improvement objectives. These progress reports shall be prepared and submitted by the school's leader and superintendent in conjunction with the school's external partner, if any.

(m) The Commissioner, with approval of the Board and to the extent permitted by federal and state statutes, may withhold funds when, after reasonable notice and opportunity to comply, the district fails to comply with directives of the Board to take specified actions designed to improve student performance in a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School.

(n) Failure by local school or municipal officials to comply with directives of the Board issued

pursuant to its authority under M.G.L. c. 69, s 1J to address performance deficiencies in a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School may result in Board action to declare the district to be chronically underperforming and place the district in receivership, as provided for by M.G.L. c. 69, s 1K and 603 CMR 2.04(5).

(7) **Training and Support for School Leaders**

(a) Subject to funding, the Department will make training and support available to the principals and members of the school leadership teams of all schools designated as Commonwealth Priority Schools or Chronically Underperforming Schools. The nature and extent of training provided in a particular case will depend on the leadership education and training history, past professional development experiences, and demonstrated knowledge and skills of the principal and leadership team. Subject to funding, the Department will make available coaches or mentors to principals and leaders of schools designated as Commonwealth Priority Schools or Chronically Underperforming Schools to advise, assist, and support them in fulfilling their leadership responsibilities.

(b) The principal or leader appointed to lead a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School shall participate in the school leadership training and support program approved for him or her by the Commissioner.

(c) The Department may fund recruitment and performance-based pay incentives to attract highly qualified individuals to serve as principals or leaders of Commonwealth Priority Schools and Chronically Underperforming Schools.

(8) **Termination of Designation as a Commonwealth Priority School**

(a) If a Commonwealth Priority School makes AYP in both English language arts and mathematics for students in the aggregate for two consecutive years following its designation as a Commonwealth Priority School, the school's governing body may request termination of the school's designation. The Commissioner may grant the request unless the school is in Restructuring.

(b) If a Commonwealth Priority School has significantly improved student performance and has met many but not all of its AYP targets for students in the aggregate for four or more years, the school's governing body may request termination of the school's designation. The Commissioner may grant the request unless the school is in Restructuring.

(9) If a Commonwealth Priority School fails to demonstrate significant improvement in student performance within 24 months after acceptance of a remedial plan by the Board, the Board may declare the school to be chronically underperforming. School officials of the district in which the school is located and members of the public shall have an opportunity to be heard by the Board prior to final action by the Board declaring a school chronically underperforming.

(10) Upon declaration by the Board that a school is chronically underperforming, the Board shall intervene in accordance with M.G.L. c. 69, § 1J, and shall issue a written order specifying actions that the district shall take to improve the academic performance of students at the school. The principal or leader appointed to lead a chronically school shall have the extraordinary powers specified in M.G.L. c. 69, § 1J. The superintendent and school committee of the district, or the school leader and board of trustees of a charter school, in which a chronically underperforming school is located shall ensure that all corrective actions ordered by the Board are implemented without delay.

2.04: Underperforming School Districts

(1) Every district shall develop and implement an annual self-evaluation and district improvement planning process, led by the district superintendent and school committee with active participation by teachers, parents, business and community leaders.

(a) The district's evaluation and planning process shall result, at least once in every three years, in the development of a written long-range plan to improve the educational programs and services and ensure the adequacy of educational facilities and equipment for students attending the district's schools.

(b) Annually, the district shall develop and implement a written plan stating specific goals for improved student performance and detailing the actions to be taken by the district to meet those goals.

(c) A district's long-range and annual improvement plans shall be premised on an analysis of data on performance by the district's students and an assessment of actions the district and its schools must take to improve that performance toward meeting State targets.

(d) Annual district improvement plans shall, in form and content, conform to requirements set forth in M.G.L. c. 69, § 1I and guidelines published by the Department.

(2) A district's plan(s) to support the improvement of any school within the district that has been designated a Commonwealth Priority School or a Chronically Underperforming School shall be incorporated into, and given high priority, in the district's annual improvement plan.

(3) The Office of Educational Quality and Accountability shall, on an annual basis, analyze data evidencing the performance of all school districts, and based on that analysis shall select districts to undergo district review.

(a) District reviews shall be conducted according to standards, policies and procedures adopted by the EMAC.

(b) The district review shall consist of an analysis of data, reports and documents and a focused interview of the district's leadership team, and shall address five areas of inquiry: assessment and evaluation, curriculum and instruction, student academic support services, leadership and governance, and business and financial management. Beginning November 1, 2004, for any district whose level of student performance and improvement is below the threshold established by the Board of Education in consultation with EMAC, the district review shall also include an in-depth review of the deficiencies the EQA has identified.

(c) In addition to the in-depth reviews that EQA shall conduct under 603 CMR 2.04 (3) (b), the EMAC may direct the EQA to conduct an in-depth review in any district based on identified deficiencies relating to any of the five areas of inquiry in 603 CMR 2.04 (3)(b).

(d) The EQA shall provide a written report of the findings and conclusions of each district review team to the district, the EMAC and the Commissioner of Education, and shall make such reports available to the public.

(e) The EQA shall provide the EMAC and the Commissioner and Board with an annual report of the results of the reviews it performs.

(4) The EMAC shall advise the Commissioner of any case in which a district review conducted by the EQA uncovered serious or widespread deficiencies in the quality of curriculum or instruction or in the adequacy of programs, services, operational management or facilities that, in the EMAC's judgment, are likely to have a substantial negative effect on the educational achievement of students attending the district's schools. The Commissioner shall provide Board members with copies of the written district review report for each district in which such deficiencies are identified.

(a) The Board, after receipt and review of such a report and any additional information it may request, shall provide an opportunity for district officials to appear before the Board or a subcommittee thereof to explain the reasons for the district's performance deficiencies and offer a plan for their remediation, and after consideration of the findings of the district review team and any contrary or explanatory information provided to the Board by district officials, shall determine whether the district's performance warrants a declaration of underperformance.

(b) If the Board determines a district to be underperforming, the Commissioner shall appoint an independent fact-finding team. Using the reports from EQA as a basis, the fact-finding team will assess the reasons for the underperformance. The fact-finding process shall include an evaluation of the capacity and willingness of the district's leadership to implement effectively an improvement plan in partnership with the Department. At the Commissioner's direction, the team shall do additional fact-finding as needed to assess the reasons for the underperformance and the prospects for improvement. When the Commissioner is satisfied with the adequacy of the fact-finding, he may take action as follows.

1. If the Commissioner concludes, based on the fact-finding, that the district leadership does have the requisite capacity and willingness to implement an improvement plan, the Commissioner shall direct the district to prepare a plan to remedy its performance deficiencies and to propose a timeframe within which identified deficiencies shall be corrected. The Board, upon the recommendation of the Commissioner, may accept, reject or require modification of the district's plan.
2. The Commissioner shall, to the extent practicable, enter into a memorandum of agreement with the district and a turnaround partner approved by the Department who will work with district leaders to support strategic planning, training and management assistance for necessary reforms. As long as the district is classified as underperforming, the district may not dismiss the turnaround partner without the agreement of the Commissioner. The district and its turnaround partner, if any, shall make regular progress reports to the Commissioner, at least twice each year.
3. If the Commissioner concludes, based on the fact-finding, that the district leadership does not have the requisite capacity and willingness to implement an improvement plan, he may either propose specific personnel changes to the district or recommend to the Board that it declare the district to be chronically underperforming.

(5) A determination by the Board, on recommendation of the Commissioner, that one or more of the conditions or occurrences set forth at 603 CMR 2.04(5)(a) through (h) exists within a particular school district shall constitute evidence that inadequate or unsound educational or fiscal practices by a school district are negatively affecting the academic performance of students within the district's schools. Such evidence shall be sufficient grounds for the Board to declare a district to be chronically underperforming and shall trigger the appointment by the Board of a receiver for the district. The receiver shall report to and take direction from the Commissioner, and shall have all of the powers normally vested in the superintendent and school committee, as provided by M.G.L. c. 69, § 1K.

(a) Failure by the district's superintendent and school committee to agree to, or failure by the district to faithfully and diligently implement, within the established timeframe, a plan approved by the Commissioner and Board pursuant to 603 CMR 2.04(4)(b) 1. or 2.

(b) Determination by the Commissioner, pursuant to 603 CMR 2.04 (4) (b) 3, that the district leadership does not have the requisite capacity and willingness to implement an improvement plan, and that the district has failed to make personnel changes recommended by the Commissioner, if any, to ensure adequate leadership.

(c) Failure by a district to submit an acceptable plan, or to faithfully and diligently implement, within the established timeframe, the plan approved by the Commissioner and Board, for the improvement of one or more schools declared, pursuant to M.G.L c. 69, § 1J, and 603 CMR 2.03, to be a Commonwealth Priority School(s) or Chronically Underperforming School(s).

(d) Failure by a district to remedy, within the time period specified by the Department or permitted by statute or agency rule, a serious violation of state or federal law regarding the provision or operation of required public education programs or services.

(e) Failure by a district to correct, within the time period specified by the Department, any school facility deficiency that seriously impedes the delivery of education services or poses a serious health or safety risk to district students.

(f) Failure by a school district or its governing city or town(s), after notice and opportunity to take corrective action(s), to comply substantially with the appropriation and spending requirements set forth at M.G. L. c. 70, 603 CMR 10.00, and any special legislative enactment related to the financing of public education.

(g) Failure by a school district, after notice and opportunity to take corrective action(s), to properly manage, lawfully expend, or truthfully report the district's use of funds appropriated or awarded for the support of public education.

(h) Failure by a school district to meet student performance and improvement objectives specified in the district improvement plan, after the period of time specified in the plan.

(6) School district and municipal officials and members of the public shall have an opportunity to be heard by the Board prior to final action by the Board to declare the district to be chronically underperforming.

(7) The Board shall proceed in accordance with M.G.L. c. 69, § 1K when requested to modify or terminate a school district receivership order.

2.05: Low-Performing Mathematics Programs

(1) Any middle or high school in which 30 percent or more of the students fail the MCAS mathematics test, excluding those students who are enrolled in special education, who are classified as having limited English proficiency, or who have not been enrolled in the school for at least two school years, and which failed to make AYP in mathematics for students in the aggregate or any student subgroup during the most recent accountability cycle, shall be considered to have a Low-Performing Mathematics Program.

(2) Mathematics teachers at schools with low-performing mathematics programs shall take the next administration of the Mathematics Content Assessment offered after the mathematics program is classified as low-performing. In addition, any mathematics teacher in a middle or high school that has been designated a Commonwealth Priority School or a Chronically Underperforming School, and any mathematics teacher who is not certified in mathematics and is teaching in a middle or high school with 30% or greater failure rate on the MCAS mathematics test, excluding those students who are enrolled in special education, who are classified as having limited English proficiency, or who have not been enrolled in the school for at least two school years, shall be considered a mathematics teacher in a Low-Performing Mathematics Program and shall take the Mathematics Content Assessment when it is next offered. A mathematics teacher shall be required to take the Mathematics Content Assessment only once.

(3) Individual results on the Mathematics Content Assessment shall be forwarded to the applicable mathematics teachers and their school principals for use in developing or revising professional development plans, as provided in the Recertification Regulations, 603 CMR 44.04 (4). These individual results are to be used for diagnostic purposes only, and individual mathematics teachers' results shall not be considered public records. The Department shall analyze and publish aggregate, statewide, district-level and school-level results, except to the extent such publication would have the effect of revealing the performance of any individual teacher.

(4) In addition to the procedures contained in 603 CMR 2.03(1)-(3), the Commissioner shall determine whether any school with a low-performing mathematics program should be designated a Commonwealth Priority School. In making this determination, the Commissioner shall consider the participation rates and performance of the school's mathematics teachers on the Mathematics Content Assessment, among other factors.

(5) The Commissioner may waive the Mathematics Content Assessment requirement for individual mathematics teachers based on a finding that such teachers have demonstrated mastery of mathematics or that special circumstances exist that make said assessment requirement inappropriate or immaterial.

Regulatory Authority:
M.G.L. c. 69, §§ 1J and 1K, c. 71, § 38G.

Compass School Name	District
Abner Gibbs Elementary	Westfield
Acton-Boxborough Regional High	Acton-Boxborough
Bay Path Regional Vocational Technical High	Southern Worcester County Vocational Technical
Becket Washington Elementary	Central Berkshire
Bristol-Plymouth Vocational Technical High	Bristol-Plymouth Vocational Technical
Cape Cod Region Vocational Technical High	Cape Cod Region Vocational Technical
Center Elementary	Easthampton
City on a Hill Charter Public High	City On A Hill Charter Public
Diman Regional Vocational Technical High	Greater Fall River
Essex Agricultural and Technical Institute	Essex Agricultural Technical
Fenway High	Boston
Four Corners Elementary	Greenfield
General John J. Stefanik Elementary	Chicopee
Greater New Bedford Vocational Technical High	Greater New Bedford
Hingham High	Hingham
Joseph P. Manning Elementary	Boston
Lynn English High	Lynn
Manassah E. Bradley Elementary	Boston
Maple Elementary	Easthampton
Medfield Senior High	Medfield
Nashoba Regional High	Nashoba
Nauset Regional High	Nauset
Needham High	Needham
Norfolk County Agricultural High	Norfolk County Agricultural District
North Shore Regional Vocational High	North Shore Regional Vocational
Plymouth South Technical High	Plymouth
Revere High	Revere
Sewell-Anderson Elementary	Lynn
Southwick-Tolland Regional High	Southwick-Tolland
Teaticket Elementary	Falmouth
Tri-County Regional Vocational Technical High	Tri County
West Elementary	Stoughton
Westford Academy	Westford
William A. Berkowitz Elementary	Chelsea
Wilmington High	Wilmington

FY 08 7061-9408 Spending Report by Initiative

Staff - 28 FTEs	**Payroll/ Admin**	**Consultants**	**Conference Expenses**	**Grants**	**Total**
9 FTEs in SPELD					
10 FTEs in SDI					
1 FTE in Curriculum Standards					
8 FTES in ATA Leadership & Administrative					
and DOE administrative assessments					
Subtotal	**$1,881,478**				**$1,881,478**
Underperforming Districts					
America's Choice - Holyoke		$1,503,000			$1,503,000
Education Development Center - Winchendon		$62,444			$62,444
Randolph, Southbridge & Gill/Montague - consultants		$93,811			$93,811
Southbridge UP District grant				$90,000	$90,000
Subtotal		**$1,659,255**	**$0**	**$90,000**	**$1,749,255**
Commissioner's Districts					
Fall River - consultants		$50,000			$50,000
Fall River UP District grant including salary differential				$170,760	$170,760
Other consulting to Comm. Districts		$16,100			$16,100
Worcester turn-around partner		$110,000			$110,000
Subtotal		**$176,100**		**$170,760**	**$346,860**
Services to Commonwealth Priority Schools					
Grants to UP and Pilot Schools				$1,517,342	$1,517,342
America's Choice evaluation - Holyoke		$54,740			$54,740
Atlas Communities		$110,675			$110,675
Pilot School consulting		$621,370			$621,370
Other consultants for CPS		$65,900			$65,900
America's Choice Kuss&Lord Schools		$170,000			$170,000
Math coaching- Worcester		$22,500			$22,500
Conference expense for networks & professional development			$16,163		$16,163
Subtotal		**$1,045,185**	**$16,163**	**$1,517,342**	**$2,578,690**
Other Targeted Assistance					
Stakeholder Working Group		$15,000			$15,000
Leadership development		$20,000			$20,000
Performance standards development		$25,000			$25,000
Ed Services Cooperative Strategy		$37,058			$37,058
Grants to collaboratives for regional capacity development				$180,000	$180,000
Other & TBD		$70,641			$70,641
Subtotal		**$167,699**		**$180,000**	**$347,699**
Professional Development for Teachers					
PD summer institutes - math/science		$558,511			$558,511
Math coaching networks		$65,000			$65,000
Arts conference	`	$2,600			$2,600
Subtotal		**$626,111**	**$0**		**$626,111**
School Review Panels/Fact-Finding Reviews					
State Review Panel consulting		$68,332			$68,332

Staff - 28 FTEs	**Payroll/ Admin**	**Consultants**	**Conference Expenses**	**Grants**	**Total**
Panel expense		$150,000			$150,000
Pilot School reviews		$72,000			$72,000
Pilot Schools - Umass Donahue evaluation		$73,333			$73,333
Subtotal		**$363,665**	**$0**	**$0**	**$363,665**
Instructional Leadership Training					
NISL, including MESPA NISL cohorts		$1,261,370			$1,261,370
NISL food expense - to school district hosts			$115,806		$115,806
NISL evaluation		$72,000			$72,000
Subtotal		**$1,333,370**	**$115,806**	**$0**	**$1,449,176**
Compass Schools					
Grants				$50,000	$50,000
Compass Schools reviews		$25,000			$25,000
Subtotal		**$25,000**	**$0**	**$50,000**	**$75,000**
Sustaining Success Grants					
Grants				$80,000	$80,000
Subtotal		**$0**	**$0**	**$80,000**	**$80,000**
Regionalization					**$0**
Regionalization study		$200,000			$200,000
Franklin County Schools Finance Problems				$50,000	$50,000
Subtotal		**$200,000**		**$50,000**	**$250,000**
Budget allocation	**$1,881,478**	**$5,596,385**	**$131,969**	**$2,138,102**	**$9,747,934**

7061-9408 FY08 account	$9,100,434
Summer Balance from FY 07 account	$647,500
Total funds	$9,747,934

Attachment F

FY 08 7061-9408 Account Spending Report by Subsidiary

Subsidiary	FY08 Budget	Description
AA Salary	**$ 1,779,695**	22 FTEs and 6 vacancies
BB Travel	**$ 40,000**	
DD Fringe	**$ 23,842**	
EE Office and Conference Expenses	**$ 137,545**	
	$ 115,806	NISL training session costs
	$ 8,957	Other conferences, including Stakeholder Working Group
	$ 800	Subscriptions/Memberships
	$ 1,200	Conference registrations
	$ 5,000	Out of state travel
	$ 5,782	Office supplies, printing, and operations assessment
FF Books & Teaching Materials	**$ 1,000**	
HH Contracted Services	**$ 5,596,385**	
	$ 170,000	America's Choice evaluation Kuss/Lord Schools
	$ 892,445	Services to Commonwealth Priority Schools & Pilot Schools
	$ 1,659,255	Services to UP Districts
	$ 176,100	Services to Commissioner's Districts
	$ 25,000	Compass School reviews
	$ 167,699	Other targeted assistance, including Stakeholder Working Group
	$ 626,111	Math/Science teachers professional development & coaching
	$ 363,665	State Review Panels, Evaluations, Fact-Finding Reviews
	$ 1,261,370	NISL training & evaluation
	$ 54,740	America's Choice evaluation - Holyoke
	$ 200,000	Regionalization study
JJ Temporary Clerical Services	**$ 5,000**	
KK Office Equipment/Operations Assessment	**$ 16,365**	
PP Grants	**$ 2,138,102**	
	$ 260,760	UP District grants
	$ 1,332,342	UP School Grants
	$ 50,000	Compass Schools
	$ 185,000	Pilot Schools
	$ 80,000	Sustaining Success
	$ 50,000	Franklin County school finance problems
	$ 180,000	Collaboratives - to build regional capacity
UU IT Equipment	**$ 10,000**	
Total Budget Allocation	**$ 9,747,934**	
7061-9408 FY08 account	$ 9,100,434	
Summer balance from FY07 account	$ 647,500	
Total funds available for FY08	$ 9,747,934	

FY 2009 7061-9408 Budget Request - Based on DOE Request and Governor's Budget, compared to FY08

Accountability & Targeted Assistance	FY 2008	% of Total	FY 2009	% of Total	FY 2009	% of Total
Services to Priority Schools & Districts (Contracted services & grants to the following districts & schools)	**$4,866,381**	**49.92%**	**$29,160,434**	**74.58%**	**$7,650,659**	**55.52%**
I Underperforming Districts - currently 5						
○ **Grants and services provided at district level**	$1,749,255		$3,010,434		$2,500,689	
II Districts in Corrective Action - currently 36						
• ***9 Commissioner's Districts***						
○ **Grants and services provided at district level**	$346,800		$1,000,000		$625,000	
○ **For 8-10 Chronically Underperforming Schools**	$704,842		$4,000,000		$1,000,000	
○ **For 85 Other Commonwealth Priority Schools****	$1,620,424		$17,000,000		$2,975,000	
○ **For 328 Other schools in accountability status***	$0		$500,000			
• ***Other Districts in Corrective Action or with a Commonwealth Priority School***						
○ **Grants and services provided at district level**	$235,000		$400,000		$250,000	
○ **For 19 Commonwealth Priority Schools****	$210,000		$3,000,000		$300,000	
○ **For 162 Other schools in accountability status***	$0		$250,000			
Professional Development & Coaching for Math/Science Teachers	**$626,111**					
Instructional Leadership Training Program	**$1,449,176**	**14.87%**	**$5,000,000**	**12.79%**	**$2,000,000**	**14.51%**
School Review Panels & Fact Finding Reviews	**$363,665**	**3.73%**	**$700,000**	**1.79%**	**$500,000**	**3.63%**
Exemplary Schools/ Effective Practice Research & Dissemination	**$155,000**	**1.59%**	**$500,000**	**1.28%**	**$250,000**	**1.81%**
Regionalization Studies	**$250,000**					
Staff, Administrative Assessments & Other Consultants						
• Accountability System Leadership & Management - 10 FTEs						
• School Performance Evaluation & Leadership Development - 9 FTEs						
• School & District Intervention Services - 15 FTEs						
• Curriculum Standards - 2 FTEs						
Total Staff - 36 FTEs for FY09 (32 FTEs for $13.7million budget)	**$1,843,537**	**18.91%**	**$3,240,000**	**8.29%**	**$2,880,000**	**20.90%**
• Contracted services not included elsewhere & administrative assessments	**$194,064**	**1.99%**	**$500,000**	**1.28%**	**$500,000**	**3.63%**
TOTALS	**$9,747,934**	**100.00%**	**$39,100,434**	**100.00%**	**$13,780,659**	**100.00%**
(Total shown for FY08 = 9,100,434 FY08 appropriation + 647,500 FY07 PAC)						

* **Accountability status** includes: schools needing improvement; schools in corrective action; or schools in restructuring - either due to their performance in the aggregate or in sub-groups.

** **Commonwealth Priority Schools:** 114 schools designated by the BOE, as a result of chronic underperforming status, to receive priority for resources and assistance. These include Chronically Underperforming Schools and Pilot Schools.